

U.S. District Court
District of Mass

Civil Action
NO. 03-12648 WGY

Chief Justice young;

Sir, I am submitting this letter to you. All contents within a relative motion too. To the Clerk's office of PRO-SE; within this said court, this letter is a request that ask this court to continue with the process of this civil action, filed on December 23, 2003, against the given defendant. While this complaint was within its preliminary screening period, my claims within the complaint showed to the court, lack of legal merit and argumental meanings of the wrongs that were placed upon me; within the 1990-1993 divorce matter, plainly executed so, by me the plaintiff. To limit the amount of information that would be available to said defendant, once it would become available to her, on her receipt, once the complaint was delivered to defendant along with the summons to answer and return. If said complaint was granted and action was to proceed, instead the complaint showed to the court confusion in complete. For this, the court determined the complaint and facts within; held no legal merit and argumental means. Therefore, the court found cause to order dismissal of said complaint against said defendant. The included contents, that being within a motion to proceed with civil action, contain facts toward the clarification of the confusion of facts within the complaint filed December 23, 2003, that showed the court; to base its decision of dismissal of the said civil action, this being the plaintiff's asking of this court, that the contents within the motion, show cause within legal merit and argumental standings, clarification of the submitted complaint statements of the facts, toward the one argumental claim, that being the wrongful placement of a personal restraint instrument of order, toward the personal liberties of the plaintiff, that within the protection of the plaintiff's IVth amendment, this

Matter Towards The Civil action ITSELF. IS a Very Sensitive issue to me in whole. Basicly. Reflecting to a relationship with a daughter; that Ive not seen in thirteen years. Primarily by way of this Placement of the Restraint upon me by the defendant of This Civil Matter. I know. By Research towards the immunity protection of one That's afforded it. Yes IT'S true. They are protected by The XIth. AS long as one so doe's behave within their Jurisdiction. When one doe's go outside of their Jurisdiction and causes harm toward someone by Route of one's civil rights. This being directed to my Constitutional rights within The Judicial system. Again my XIVth amendment not being afforded me; by way of Due Process within The Probate matter. IVth amendment rights not afforded me Through The Improper Placed Restraining order upon Plaintiff. Wrongful Placement of an order; IT'S standings of Usage placed upon me that caused unnessary personal restraint upon the Plaintiff's liberties and life, For This. One that practice's outside of their Jurisdiction IS NOT SO given Their protection of the Said XIth amendment. I Pray to you Sir. To accept my Submission of My Motion to Proceed with This Civil action Filed on December 23, 2003. IT'S Given Facts within Clarification of Complaint.

Sincerely yours
1/28/04 Ned Langore

cc: Ned J Langore